

*City of San José*  
***Coyote Valley Specific Plan***

---

**Summary of Task Force Meeting**  
**December 12, 2005**  
**200 E. Santa Clara Street, Rooms W118-120**

**Task Force Members Present**

Co-chair Mayor Ron Gonzales, Co-chair Council member Forrest Williams, Supervisor Don Gage, Chuck Butters, Eric Caruthers, Helen Chapman, Russ Danielson, Pat Dando, Gladwin D'Sousa, Craig Edgerton, Dan Hancock, Doreen Morgan, Chris Platten, Ken Saso, Steve Speno, Neil Struthers, and Terry Watt.

**Task Force Members Absent**

Phaedra Ellis-Lamkins and Steve Schott, Jr.

**Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Members Present**

Dawn Cameron (County Roads), Mike Griffis (County Roads), Jane Mark (County Parks), Steve Kinsella (Gavilan College), Michele Beasley (Greenbelt Alliance), Tedd Faraone (Coyote Valley Alliance for Smart Planning), Melissa Hippard (Sierra Club), Sarah Muller (Working Partnerships), Brian Schmidt (Committee for Green Foothills), Shanna Boigon (SCCAOR), Tim Steele (Sobrato), and Kerry Williams (Coyote Housing Group).

**City and Other Public Agencies Staff Present**

Council member Linda J. LeZotte (Council District 1), Jennifer Malutta (Mayor's Office), Emily Moody (Mayor's Office), Rachel Gibson (Supervisor Don Gage's Office), Anthony Drummond (Council District 2), Rabia Chaudhry (District 8), Laurel Prevetti (PBCE), Joe Horwedel (PBCE), Sal Yakubu (PBCE), Susan Walsh (PBCE), Mike Mena (PBCE), Sylvia Do (PBCE), Perihan Ozdemir (PBCE), Regina Mancera (PBCE), Gerry De Guzman (Public Works), Rebecca Flores (Housing), and Dave Mitchell (PRNS).

## **Consultants Present**

Doug Dahlin (Dahlin Group), Roger Shanks (Dahlin Group), Paul Barber (KenKay Associates), Jim Musbach (EPS), Bill Wagner (HMH Engineers), Jodi Starbird (DJP&A) and Eileen Goodwin (Apex Strategies).

## **Community Members Present**

Mayor Dennis Kennedy, Mike Biggar, Michael Bini, Roger Costa, Juliana Chow, Frank Crane, June Crane, Consuelo Crosby, Jo Crosby, Richard DeSmet, Robert Eltgroth, Jack Faraone, Art Gonzales, Jim Goodell, Jeff Hare, Janet Hebert, Matt King, Jack Kuzia, Pat Kuzia, Rick Linqvist, Trevis Linqvist, Peter Mandel, Ken Mikami, Laura Perry, Ash Pirayou, Kirstin Powell, Peter Rothchild, Art Sanchez, Sheila Sanchez, Annie Saso, George Thomas, Shellé Thomas, Lucy Valencia, Don Weden, Kim Weden, Don Wells, Pete Silva, Sharon Simonson, and Tom Armstrong.

### **1. Welcome**

The meeting convened at 5:30 p.m. with co-chair Mayor Ron Gonzales welcoming everyone to the 38<sup>th</sup> Coyote Valley Specific Plan (CVSP) Task Force meeting.

### **2. Acceptance of October 24, 2005 Task Force Meeting Summary**

Mayor Gonzales called for a motion to accept the October 24, 2005 Task Force meeting summary. The motion passed unanimously.

### **3. Acceptance of Updated Work Plan**

Laurel Prevetti, Deputy Director of the Planning, Building and Code Enforcement (PBCE) Department, provided an overview of the updated draft CVSP work plan. Beginning in 2006, there would be bi-weekly Task Force meetings, monthly community meetings, and monthly City Council progress reports. Progress reports to the City Council would be formatted as workshops to allow greater opportunities for questions and answers. As a result, Council progress reports will take place during afternoon Council meetings. The CVSP will go to Council for consideration in 2007.

The Task Force provided the following questions and comments regarding the work plan:

- Mayor Gonzales said that he hoped that the CVSP would go to Council for consideration by the end of several council members’ terms in December 2006, but the work plan extends into 2007. *Mayor Gonzales explained that this is a draft work plan proposed by staff.*
- Since Task Force meetings will be taking place more often, we need to make sure that we have sufficient time to consider each issue. *Co-chair Forrest Williams note that even with the increased frequency of meetings, the quality of the project would not be sacrificed.*
- Does not believe the CVSP process is being rushed since it has been going on for over four years.
- What are the “draft timing and logistical requirements”? *The draft timing and logistical requirements consist of items 1-9 of the co-chairs’ memorandum which was originally distributed to the Task Force on May 9, 2005.*
- Recommended regrouping the discussion topics so that they are more cohesive. For instance, the fiscal analysis, draft financing strategy, and draft timing and logistical requirements should be discussed together.
- Would like to receive a copy of the draft Specific Plan on CD. *The draft Specific Plan can be available on CD for the Task Force. It will also be available on the CVSP website.*

#### **4. Discussion of a Proposed Gavilan College Campus in Coyote Valley**

Dr. Steve Kinsella, President of the Gavilan Joint Community College District (GJCCD), provided an overview of the proposed Gavilan College campus in Coyote Valley. Steve explained Coyote Valley’s projected demand for community college services and the role of community colleges in the community.

Laura Perry, member of the GJCCD Board of Trustees, stated that in March 2004, District voters approved Measure E, a \$108 million facilities bond. The bond allocated funds to create expanded, permanent facilities in Hollister and the greater Morgan Hill area, including over \$8 million to acquire land for a facility for Morgan Hill and Coyote Valley residents. The curriculum at the Coyote Valley campus would be specific to the community’s interests.

Jim Goodell, President of Public Private Ventures, Inc. and consultant to GJCCD, explained the State requirements for community colleges, and the acquisition and development of the Coyote Valley campus.

The Task Force provided the following questions and comments regarding the proposed Gavilan College campus:

- Why is Gavilan College making a presentation to the Task Force? *Laurel explained that it was important to understand the full nature of Gavilan College’s proposal. This is an opportunity for*

*the City and community college to discuss potential policy implications and work together to resolve issues.*

- *What percentage of the Coyote Valley campus would be financed through the Measure E bond? Steve stated that the Measure E bond would be used for land acquisition, but a majority of the funding is expected to come from the State.*
- *How long would it take to secure funding from the State? Jim explained that the District would qualify for student funding once the Coyote Valley campus exceeds 500 full-time equivalent students. A portion of the Measure E bond could be used as a leveraging device to put the District into a more competitive position for State funding.*
- *Do community colleges receive funding for average daily attendance? Is there a loss of revenue when students go to other Districts? Steve explained that Districts receive funding for full-time equivalent students. If the GJCCD could capture a third of the students they are currently losing, the District would be 50 percent larger than they are today.*
- *Gavilan College is losing students to other Districts. A Coyote Valley campus would make Gavilan College more accessible.*
- *Is Gavilan College exempt from paying their fair share of the infrastructure plan? Steve clarified that Gavilan College is a public beneficiary, not private entity. Gavilan College will pay towards the infrastructure plan as obligated.*
- *Does Gavilan College's Measure E bond include specific language about building a campus in Coyote Valley? Steve explained that Measure E identified that a campus could be built in the greater Morgan Hill area. The GJCCD has ability to build anywhere within the District, assuming approval from the California Postsecondary Education Commission.*
- *How will the CVSP's roadways change to accommodate Gavilan College? Doug Dahlin, with Dahlin Group, suggested that the street going through the campus site could become a Bus Rapid Transit right-of-way. Vehicles could be re-routed around the campus. Council member Williams stated that the EIR would address traffic issues and that roadways would be modified accordingly.*
- *Concerned that relocating a street to accommodate Gavilan College would be setting an uncomfortable precedent for future projects in Coyote Valley.*
- *Need to consider what additional infrastructure will be required beyond the projects that already have been approved.*
- *Unlike Morgan Hill and Gilroy, Coyote Valley will be a highly urbanized community. It is imperative that Gavilan College create an urban campus. Steve stated that Gavilan College would be consistent with urban design concepts to the extent that the State allows. Mayor Gonzales indicated that the City has attempted discussion with the State to change the campus site planning requirements in light of contemporary urban design.*
- *It would be beneficial to bring in State resources early to work with the City.*
- *Concerned that Gavilan College may be moving forward at a fast pace and want to be sure that they do so in consideration of the CVSP's goals. Understands the value of having a community college, but the campus needs to achieve the CVSP's goals. Jim explained that although State laws regarding site design requirements may change overtime, it might be a difficult process. They are willing to work with the State to pursue potential changes.*

- Preferred identifying a site upfront so that the campus would have an integrated feel with the community.
- If Gavilan College is interested creating an urban campus, they need to be aggressive in getting past State standards.
- Would like a joint-use library between the City and Gavilan College.
- San Jose City College has structured parking. *Jim stated that, if possible, Gavilan College would have structured parking.*
- Is the campus site 50 or 80 acres? If a 30-acre athletic field cannot be accommodated by the CVSP, is a 50-acre campus acceptable? *Jim stated that Gavilan College is currently shown as a 50-acre site. 80 acres is the standard site area requirement as specified by the State.*
- The community should have access to Gavilan College's 30-acre athletic field.
- A 30-acre athletic field does not seem appropriate for Coyote Valley. Can this field be reduced in size? The high school already has a proposed athletic field.
- Recommended against having a joint-use athletic field due to the complicated nature of ownership and maintenance. *Steve stated that this would be dependent upon the nature of the joint-use agreement.*
- Recommended creating an urban satellite facility in Coyote Valley, while maintaining a full program in Gilroy. Students interested in Gavilan College's athletic program can go to the Gilroy campus. *Steve indicated that 80,000 Coyote Valley residents deserve a full campus facility. Gavilan College's objective is to ensure that there would be a facility to serve Coyote Valley.*
- Although there are 1.8 million residents in Santa Clara County, there is not one community college per 80,000 residents.
- Do the jobs created by Gavilan College count towards the count for 50,000 industry-driving jobs? No.
- With the addition of Gavilan College in Coyote Valley, where will industrial and workplace land uses be redistributed? *Laurel explained that the CVSP would maintain its 50,000 industry-driving jobs by intensifying workplace opportunities along Monterey Road, south of Bailey Avenue.*
- Gavilan College is an asset that could help attract industries down to Coyote Valley.
- Recommended that the City and Gavilan College work collectively to change State legislation and make the campus site planning more urban and compatible with the CVSP.
- Not opposed to having a community college. Need to work together to achieve a mutually beneficial plan for both the District and City.
- Overall very pleased with the possibility of a Gavilan College campus in Coyote Valley, and want to be sure that the campus design will be urban to meet the design goals for the Coyote Valley Specific Plan.

The public provided the following comments:

- Frank Crane, representing the Mikami family, was concerned that the Gavilan College site would create an uneven jobs/housing balance during early phasing increments. He was concerned that Gavilan College would bring in jobs that would not count towards the 50,000 industry-driving jobs requirement. Since Gavilan College would create non-driving industry jobs during early phasing increments, the east side of Monterey Road could be phased earlier to provide adequate housing.
- Shellé Thomas indicated support for locating a Gavilan College campus in Coyote Valley. The community college would be beneficial to the region.
- Shanna Boigon, with the Santa Clara County Association of Realtors, stated that community colleges are good assets to a community. In a recent *Silicon Valley Business Journal* article, Steve Kinsella stated that there needs to be a hi-tech campus or else Silicon Valley would lose its edge. Gavilan College could be tech-oriented campus that prepares its students to be competitive in Silicon Valley.

## **5. Acceptance of the Project Description of the CVSP**

Laurel reviewed the CVSP project description, a basis for the environmental impact report (EIR). To allow for flexibility, the EIR will do an analysis based on 26,650 residential units and 13.7 million square feet of workplace. A correction was made to Subsection C of Section D – the CVSP will grow over some 40 years, not 25 years. Laurel clarified that Table 1 reflected the net acreages for private development. The project description will be presented to the Council during the fourth progress report.

The Task Force provided the following questions and comments regarding the CVSP project description:

- Why is the Task Force reviewing the project description? *The CVSP EIR process is concurrent to the Specific Plan process and the project description must be finalized to enable the continued preparation of the EIR. Basically, the Plan itself becomes the project description.*
- What is staff asking the Task Force to do? *Staff is asking for Task Force acceptance of the project description as the basis for the EIR analysis.*
- What will the staff ask Council to do? *Staff will ask for Council acceptance of the project description. Although the project description can be changed, it is a lengthy, expensive process.*
- Recognizes that the land use map will continue to change, but there needs to be stability at some point. *The regulatory framework needs flexibility in order to respond to changing conditions. The CVSP document and its zoning code provisions will provide more details and certainty.*
- The Composite Infrastructure Plan needs to be in place. Concerned that Gavilan College may be setting a precedent for moving the Plan's fundamental infrastructure.

- What is “community sustainability?” What are the major sustainability goals? Will the Specific Plan include sustainability indicators? *Sustainability indicators will be included in the draft Specific Plan. The CVSP will reflect values the Council and Task Force are interested in including.*
- San Mateo County’s “Indicators for a Sustainable San Mateo County” report is available online at [www.sustainablesanmateo.org](http://www.sustainablesanmateo.org).
- Under Section D, would like to add “and accessible” to the last sentence of Subsection B’s fourth paragraph. The modified sentence should read: “ All areas of the urban community are well connected and accessible through this multi-modal approach.”
- Under Subsection G of Section D, concerned about how “lower impact” and “higher impact” agricultural practices are defined. Concerned that the wording may be a policy commitment.
- Under Subsection G of Section D, concerned about encouraging the establishment of executive “farm estates” at this time since it is still unclear how development will be separated from agricultural activities. The CVSP is still in the process of creating the Greenbelt Strategy. Recommended against representing this issue as a policy commitment at this time. *The South Coyote Valley Greenbelt Strategy will be discussed at the Task Force meetings in early 2006.*
- Liked the Greenbelt concepts presented at the September 1, 2005 community meeting, particularly strategies on how agricultural easements and land with development potential could be valued and acquired to create a Greenbelt.
- In Table 1, do “roadways” include trails? *No, acreages for trails are included under “other infrastructure.”*
- In Table 1, the acreages for private development have changed. *Table 1 reflects net acreages derived from a strict typology approach.*
- In Table 2, is the 1.75-0.40 floor area ratio (FAR) for campus industrial a typo? If this is a typo, does it affect the rest of the chart? *Staff will make sure the figures are consistent.*
- In Table 2, do the figures reflect Gavilan College’s proposal? *No.*
- When will there be discussions about health care clinics and daycares? *Community health care clinics are expected to be discussed at the January 2006 Task Force meeting.*
- What is the deadline for submitting comments regarding the project description? *Comments should be submitted to staff by Thursday, December 22, 2005.*

The public provided the following comments:

- Mayor Dennis Kennedy, with the City of Morgan Hill, was concerned that Section E, Description of the Project, was short. Mayor Kennedy reiterated some comments the City of Morgan Hill included in its NOP response. The project description should be complete and accurate in order to evaluate the CVSP’s environmental impacts. The project description should include: (1) the level of street improvements proposed, (2) the Greenbelt strategy, (3) the implementation ordinance, and (4) a financing plan. The City

of Morgan Hill would appreciate the opportunity to review the project description again once it is more complete.

- Kirsten Powell, representing the Morgan Hill Unified School District (MHUSD), indicated that Table 1 double counted the acreages for shared school playfields. MHUSD is concerned about how the existing charter school site would be affected since the District is required to use the site for a charter school. The District has been working with staff, but the school facilities subcommittee has not met since the last Task Force meeting. The District is waiting for traffic generation studies in order to determine safe routes to schools. Until this study is completed and the subcommittee reaches a conclusion, the District urges against finalizing school site locations.
- Brian Schmidt, with the Committee for Green Foothills, reiterated some comments he included in his NOP response. Any plans to eliminate or reduce the General Plan triggers should be included in the project description. Since this is not mentioned in the project description, he assumed that the General Plan triggers would remain unchanged. Additional triggers or restrictions can be added to the CVSP without environmental review, but they should be included in the project description. According to the Council's Vision and Expected Outcomes, the 50,000 jobs are defined as "primarily industrial/office jobs," not "exclusively 50,000 industry/office jobs." It is important to clarify this definition to ensure that Coyote Valley provides an adequate number of housing for the amount of jobs proposed. Creating more jobs than housing would result in a net loss of housing relative to the number of jobs created. Brian also made a correction to the November 30, 2005 Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) meeting summary. The CVSP estimates that 15-20 percent of Coyote Valley residents would be uninsured and that the project would provide health care for 10,000 people. Brian corrected that 10,000 people is not 15-20 percent of an 80-85,000 population. If the CVSP plans to provide health care facilities, it needs to have the right estimates.
- Melissa Hippard, with the Sierra Club, indicated that there is a vision for Coyote Valley development to "grow" from the environment. She hoped to see changes to achieve this vision and was encouraged to see that the project description included a sustainable vision for Coyote Valley. Melissa stated that she participated in a productive CVSP environmental focus group meeting and looked forward to seeing suggestions from that meeting shown on a future land use plan and incorporated into the CVSP. Melissa indicated that it was important to clarify that the project description is not the CVSP's final vision and that the draft land use map is not the final map to be reviewed for the EIR.
- Consuelo Crosby, a South Coyote Greenbelt property owner, urged the Task Force not to accept the project description until the Greenbelt Strategy is more defined. The City should withdraw from any plans for the Greenbelt since the City does not have the right to plan for the Greenbelt. The Greenbelt does not benefit from this Specific Plan. The Greenbelt should remain with the County.

Mayor Gonzales stated that staff will incorporate the comments from tonight's meeting into the project description, as appropriate.



## **6. Public Comments**

Eric Carruthers stated that he was impressed with the Audubon Society's letter included in the Task Force meeting packet. He was particularly impressed with the points made regarding open space preservation, current development triggers, phasing, and smart growth design. Eric urged staff to appropriately respond to these issues.

There were not any public comments.

## **7. Adjourn**

Mayor Gonzales adjourned the meeting at 7:20 p.m. The next Task Force meeting will take place on January 9, 2005.